Astronomy & Astrophysics manuscript no. paperaanda
March 27, 2014
©ESO 2014

The spin frequency distributions of binary millisecond pulsars

A. Papitto[1⋆] , D. F. Torres[1,2], N. Rea[1,3], and T. M. Tauris[4,5]

[1] Institut de Ciències de l'Espai (IEEC-CSIC), Campus UAB, Fac. de Ciències, Torre C5, parell, 2a planta, 08193 Barcelona, Spain
[2] Institució Catalana de Recerca i Estudis Avançats (ICREA), 08010 Barcelona, Spain
[3] Astronomical Institute "Anton Pannekoek", University of Amsterdam, Postbus 94249, NL-1090-GE Amsterdam, The Netherlands
[4] Argelander-Insitut für Astronomie, Universität Bonn, Auf dem Hügel 71, 53121 Bonn, Germany
[5] Max-Planck-Institut für Radioastronomie, Auf dem Hügel 69, 53121 Bonn, Germany

Received date

ABSTRACT

Rotation-powered millisecond radio pulsars are assumed to have been spun up to their present period by a 10^8-10^9yr long X-ray bright phase of accretion of matter and angular momentum, in a low-to-intermediate mass binary system. Recently, the discovery of sources in a transitional phase, alternating cyclically between accretion and rotation-powered states on time scales of few years or less, have been reported. Here, we present a thorough statistical analysis of the spin distributions of the various classes of millisecond pulsars to assess the evolution of their spin period between the different stages. Accreting sources which showed oscillations exclusively during thermonuclear type-I X-ray bursts (nuclear-powered millisecond pulsars) are found to be significantly faster than rotation-powered sources, while accreting sources which possess a magnetosphere and show coherent pulsations (accreting millisecond pulsars) are not. On the other hand, if accreting millisecond pulsars and eclipsing rotation-powered millisecond pulsars form a common class of transitional pulsars, these are shown to have an intermediate spin distribution between the faster nuclear-powered millisecond pulsars and the slower non-eclipsing rotation-powered millisecond pulsars. We interpret these findings in terms of a spin down due to the decreasing mass accretion rate during the latest stages of the accretion phase, and of the different orbital evolutionary channels mapped by the various classes of pulsars. Instrumental selection effects are expected to have a small effect on the observed samples.

Key words. accretion, accretion discs – magnetic fields — pulsars: general — stars: neutron – stars:rotation — X-rays: binaries

arXiv:1403.6775v1 [astro-ph.HE] 26 Mar 2014

1. Introduction

The accretion of 0.1 – 0.2 $M_\odot$ transferred by a companion star through an accretion disc in a low-mass X-ray binary (LMXB) is the widely accepted process to explain old neutron stars (NSs) spinning at a period of few milliseconds (Alpar et al. 1982; Radhakrishnan & Srinivasan 1982; Bhattacharya & van den Heuvel 1991). This framework is known as the *recycling* scenario and thus identifies X-ray bright NSs as the progenitors of radio millisecond pulsars, which are powered by their loss of rotational energy. In this scenario, after a 0.1 – 10 Gyr long X-ray bright accretion phase that spins up the NS (see, e.g., Tauris et al. 2012) the pressure exerted by the NS magnetic field is able to sweep out the light-cylinder volume, sparking the rotation-powered pulsed radio emission of the *recycled* pulsar. The mass-accretion process not only spun up the $\gtrsim$ 300 binary and isolated rotation-powered millisecond pulsars known in the Galaxy, but probably also reduced their magnetic field strength to values of 10^7 – 10^9 G (see, e.g., Bhattacharya & Srinivasan 1995, for a review).

The ability of mass accretion to spin up a NS in a LMXB is demonstrated by the observation of coherent pulsations at a period of few ms from 15 NSs (accreting millisecond pulsars, hereafter accreting-MSPs; Wijnands & van der Klis 1998, Patruno & Watts 2012), and of quasi coherent-oscillations observed from an additional 10 sources exclusively during thermonuclear type-I X-ray bursts (nuclear powered millisecond pulsars, hereafter nuclear-MSPs[1]; Chakrabarty et al. 2003, Watts 2012). In addition, the swings between rotation and accretion-powered behaviour recently observed from IGR J18245–2452 (Papitto et al. 2013a; Ferrigno et al. 2013; Linares et al. 2013) and PSR J1023+0038 (Archibald et al. 2009; Stappers et al. 2013; Patruno et al. 2014), and proposed for XSS J12270–4859 (Papitto et al. 2013b; Bassa et al. 2013), demonstrated that NSs in some low mass X-ray binaries may alternate cyclically between rotation and accretion-powered states on short time-scales of a few years, or less.

In this paper, we compare the spin frequency distributions of the various samples of MSPs discovered so far, in order to test theories describing the spin evolution of NSs as they evolve from the accretion to the rotation-powered stages of the recycling scenario (see, e.g., Tauris 2012, and references therein).

2. The population of rotation and accretion powered binary millisecond pulsars

In order to rely on the most updated sample of the rapidly growing population of rotation-powered millisecond pulsars (hereafter RMSPs), we consider the lists of radio MSPs compiled by D. R. Lorimer[2] and P. C. C. Freire[3], corresponding to sources found in the Galactic field and globular clusters, respectively.

⋆ papitto@ice.csic.es

[1] We stress that here, the term *nuclear* refers only to the mechanism powering the emission of the source while it shows pulsations, whereas for most of the time the X-ray output is due to mass accretion.
[2] available from http://astro.phys.wvu.edu/GalacticMSPs
[3] available from http://www.naic.edu/ pfreire/GCpsr.html



Fig. 1. Spin frequency distribution of binary eclipsing and non eclipsing rotation-powered millisecond pulsars (top panel; blue and cyan, respectively), and accreting and nuclear-powered millisecond pulsars (bottom panel; red and magenta, respectively).



Fig. 2. Spin frequency distribution of non-eclipsing RMSPs (cyan), transitional-MSPs (defined as the sum of eclipsing-RMSPs and accreting-MSPs; green) and nuclear-MSPs (magenta).

These lists contain 339 radio pulsars with a spin period shorter than 30 ms. Slightly less than half of them are isolated sources, or systems for which an orbital period could not be determined yet. In the following, we only consider binary RMSPs in order to perform a comparison with their accreting progenitors. Furthermore, the evolutionary history of isolated MSPs might have been somewhat different than that of pulsars with a companion star (e.g. Verbunt et al. 1987; Kluzniak et al. 1988). Binary RMSPs showing irregular eclipses of their radio emission (Roberts 2013, hereafter eclipsing-RMSPs), on the other hand, probably share a closer link with their accreting progenitors. The observed eclipses are interpreted in terms of mass ejected from the system by irradiation of the pulsar (Fruchter et al. 1988; Kluzniak et al. 1988). The semi-degenerate companion stars of, at least some of, these eclipsing pulsars are very close to filling their Roche lobe (see, e.g., Breton et al. 2013). The mass transferred by these companions may then occasionally overcome the pressure of the radio pulsar, driving the system into an accretion state, as recently observed from two eclipsing pulsars (Archibald et al. 2009; Papitto et al. 2013a; Patruno et al. 2014). We summarize the properties of the various populations of binary RMSPs in Table 1, and plot the distribution of their frequencies in the top panel of Fig. 1.

Among accreting NSs in LMXBs, the spin period is known for a total of 25 sources (15 accreting-MSPs; 10 nuclear-MSPs), cf. Section 1. All these systems are X-ray transients, accreting at a rate up to 10^{-9} $M_\odot$ yr^{-1} only during their few weeks-long outbursts, and being found in quiescence at levels corresponding to less than $< 10^{-12}$ $M_\odot$ yr^{-1}, for most of the time (e.g. Coriat et al. 2012, and references therein). Even if these two classes overlap (burst oscillations were observed also from eight accreting-MSPs), we consider sources which showed oscillations only during bursts (nuclear-MSPs) to form a distinct class, as they did not show evidence of possessing a magnetosphere able to channel the accreted mass close to the magnetic poles, leading to coherent pulsations. Indeed, nuclear-MSP bursts tend to be observed in the soft, brighter states, while they occur even in the hard state for accreting-MSPs (Galloway et al. 2008; Watts et al. 2009; Watts 2012), possibly pointing to an important role played by the presence of a magnetosphere in determining burst oscillation properties. The properties of the spin distribution of LMXB pulsars are summarized in Table 1 and plotted in the bottom panel of Fig. 1.

The recent discovery of systems performing transitions between rotation and accretion-powered states over short timescales, motivates us also to tentatively define an intermediate class of systems, dubbed as transitional pulsars (transitional-MSPs). These systems behave as RMSPs when the mass inflow rate is low and the pressure of the pulsar is able to prevent mass from falling onto the NS, while they are seen as accreting-MSPs when the transferred mass is able to overcome this pressure. IGR J18245–2452, observed as an accreting-MSP and an eclipsing-RMSP at different times (Papitto et al. 2013a), is the prototype of this class. A transition to a rotation-powered state during X-ray quiescence has been proposed also for a number of accreting-MSPs on the basis of the observed spin-down (Patruno 2010b,a; Hartman et al. 2011; Papitto et al. 2011; Riggio et al. 2011; Patruno et al. 2012b), optical reprocessed emission (Burderi et al. 2003; Campana et al. 2004; Di Salvo et al. 2008; Burderi et al. 2009; D'Avanzo et al. 2009), and orbital evolution (Di Salvo et al. 2008; Burderi et al. 2009, Patruno et al. 2012b), even if radio and γ-ray pulsations could not be detected so far (Burgay et al. 2003; Iacolina et al. 2009, 2010; Xing & Wang 2013). On the other hand, only eclipsing-RMSPs can be considered as possible candidates to undergo transition into an accretion phase, as the companion star has to spill matter through the inner Lagrangian point of the orbit to do so. Hence, we define a class of transitional-MSPs as the sum of accreting-MSPs and eclipsing-RMSPs. The spin distribution of this class is plotted in the middle panel of Fig. 2, where the distribution of non-eclipsing millisecond radio pulsars (non-eclipsing-RMSPs) and nuclear-MSPs are also shown.

We note that only sources with a spin period lower than 30 ms are considered in these samples, as we aim at compar-

Table 1. Samples of binary millisecond pulsars considered in this work.

Class	N	$\langle\nu\rangle$ (Hz)	$\tilde{\nu}$ (Hz)	σ_ν (Hz)	Description
RMSPs	199	268	274	139	Rotation-powered (radio) pulsars in a binary system
galactic-RMSPs	128	262	267	141	RMSPs in the Galactic field
clusters-RMSPs	71	277	276	138	RMSPs of globular clusters
eclipsing-RMSPs	42	367	377	154	RMSPs showing irregular eclipsed of their radio pulsed emission
non-eclipsing-RMSPs	157	242	252	122	RMSPs not showing irregular eclipsed of their radio pulsed emission
LMXBs	25	413	401	150	All accretion-powered pulsars (accreting-MSPs + nuclear-MSPs)
accreting-MSPs	15	353	377	140	Accreting millisecond pulsars (X-ray coherent oscillations)
nuclear-MSPs	10	502	552	123	Nuclear-powered millisecond pulsars (only X-ray burst oscillations)
transitional-MSPs	56	365	377	150	Transitional pulsars (accreting-MSPs + eclipsing-RMSPs)

Notes. Number of objects, mean, median and standard deviation, of the spin frequency distributions of the considered classes of rotation and accretion-powered millisecond pulsars ($P < 30$ ms) in binary systems. IGR J18245−2452 is counted as both an eclipsing- and an accreting-MSP.

ing only pulsars which are at (or close to) the end of the recycling process. While the exact value of this threshold is somewhat arbitrary, a significantly slower period may indicate that the spin-up process has been interrupted halfway, or has recently been activated, as it may happen in the dense environment of globular clusters where dynamical exchange interactions are relatively frequent (Verbunt et al. 1987). Such a criterion therefore leads to the exclusion of an accreting source like the 11 Hz pulsar, IGR 17480–2446, in Terzan 5, which is thought to be just mildly recycled, having initiated its spin-up phase less than about 10 Myr ago (see, e.g. Patruno et al. 2012a).

3. Comparison of the spin distributions

In order to perform a comparison between the spin frequency distributions of the various classes defined in the previous section, we rely on a distribution-free test like the Kuiper test (Kuiper 1960; Stephens 1974; Paltani 2004). A Student's t-test (as applied in Tauris 2012) is not ideal to compare the various spin distributions, as it can be shown (e.g., with a Shapiro-Wilk test) that most of these spin frequency distributions are far from being compatible with a normal distribution. The use of the Kuiper test is preferred with respect to the Kolmogorov-Smirnov (used, e.g., by Hessels 2008), as it has the advantage of being equally sensitive to deviations close to the median and towards the tails of the distribution.

The spin distributions of binary rotation-powered millisecond pulsars in the Galactic field (galactic-RMSPs) and those belonging to a globular cluster (clusters-RMSPs) do not show a significant difference. The probability that the two ensembles are drawn from the same distribution is 0.28, and we therefore consider them as a single sample. A significant difference is instead present between eclipsing-RMSPs and non-eclipsing-RMSPs. The former have a mean spin frequency larger by ~ 125 Hz, and the probability that they share the same parent distribution is 8.5×10^{-4}.

A glance at Table 1 and Figs. 1 and 2 might lead to conclude that, on average, accreting-MSPs are faster by ∼100 Hz than binary millisecond radio pulsars (RMSPs), as noted by several authors (Ferrario & Wickramasinghe 2007; Hessels 2008; Tauris 2012). However, comparing the distributions of accreting-MSPs and RMSPs gives a probability of 0.374 that they come from the same parent distribution, a value which clearly does not allow us to identify any significant difference (see the relational diagram plotted in Fig. 3, where we report the probabilities that the various samples are drawn from the same distribution). To check the influence of the paucity of known accreting-MSPs on this result, we simulated 10^7 samples of $\mathcal{N}$ objects with spin frequencies based on a normal distribution with the same mean and standard deviation of known accreting-MSPs (see Table 1). We then re-ran the simulations varying the simulated number of objects ($\mathcal{N}$). We found that the accreting-MSPs should be constituted by at least $\mathcal{N} = 50$ objects, to detect a 3σ difference with the RMSP distribution 90% of the times on the 10^7 simulations. We conclude that if the spin frequency distributions of accreting-MSPs and RMSPs are different, we would be able to detect such a difference only when the number of known accreting-MSPs has increased by more than a factor three (assuming a normal distribution).

On the other hand, accreting sources which showed pulsations only during type-I X-ray bursts (nuclear-MSPs) are the fastest class of objects among those defined in this work. Their average frequency is roughly double than that of RMSPs, and is ∼90 Hz larger than that of accreting-MSPs. The difference with respect to RMSPs is significant, as the probability that they come from the same distribution is 2.5×10^{-3}. The probability that the samples of accreting-MSPs and nuclear-MSPs come from the same parent distribution is 0.154, although such a value is hardly constraining. We have performed equivalent simulations as explained above, and we found that each sample should be made of at least 60 objects in order for a Kuiper test to identify a statistically significant spin difference between these two classes.

Considering instead the total LMXB sample comprising both accreting-MSPs and nuclear-MSPs, these are significantly faster than RMSPs, with a probability of only $\lesssim 1$ per cent that the two samples share the same distribution.

Accreting-MSPs and eclipsing-RMSPs have a very similar spin distribution (see Table 1). The difference between their average frequencies is just 14 Hz, and the probability that the two samples come from the same parent distribution is 0.912. This is compatible with the hypothesis that they form a common class of objects at the same evolutionary epoch, which we labelled transitional-MSPs. Comparing transitional-MSPs with non-eclipsing-RMSPs we find that the probability that the two distributions are compatible is 3.9×10^{-5}, indicating a significant difference. A low probability (0.048) is also found if transitional-MSPs are compared to the faster nuclear-MSPs. The tentatively defined class of transitional-MSPs therefore has an intermediate spin frequency distribution, between that of nuclear-MSPs and non-eclipsing-RMSPs.



Fig. 3. Relational diagram of the various samples defined in this work, based on the comparison of their spin frequency distributions. Dashed lines connect samples that have a probability lower than 5 per cent of coming from the same parent distribution, while solid lines connect those with a larger probability. Numbers give the probability that the considered samples are drawn from the same distributions, evaluated with a Kuiper test.

We summarize our results in the relational diagram plotted in Fig. 3, where dashed lines connect samples which have a probability of less than 5% of being drawn from the same parent distribution, while solid lines connect those for which we evaluated a larger probability.

4. Discussion

The analysis we have presented shows that nuclear-MSPs is the only class of accretion-powered pulsars that is significantly faster than RMSPs, while accreting-MSPs are not. However, if accreting-MSPs and eclipsing-RMSPs form a common class of transitional pulsars, this class would have an intermediate spin frequency between the faster nuclear-MSPs and the slower non-eclipsing radio pulsars.

The frequency difference between nuclear-MSPs compared to RMSPs ($\gtrsim$ 230 Hz) cannot be due to the weak magneto-dipole spin-down torque acting onto the NS during the rotation-powered pulsar phase, as this develops on a long time-scale, $\tau_{em} \approx 10$ Gyr (for a NS spinning at 500 Hz, with a magnetic dipole of 10^{26} G cm^3). The spin-down torque developing during the latest stages of the accretion phase, caused by the interaction between the NS magnetic field and the plasma rotating in the disc, is much stronger (up to a factor of $\sim$ 100 Ghosh & Lamb 1979). As this torque is more intense when the NS is faster ($\propto \nu^2$, e.g., Rappaport et al. 2004), it eventually balances the rate at which the accreted matter delivers its specific angular momentum to the NS ($\propto \nu^{-1/3}$). The compact object therefore reaches an equilibrium spin value, which was estimated by Kluźniak & Rappaport (2007) for a 1.4 $M_\odot$ NS as

$$\nu_{\rm eq}^{\rm (magn)} \simeq 723\, \mu_{26}^{-6/7}\, \dot{M}_{-10}^{3/7}\ {\rm Hz}, \qquad (1)$$

where μ_{26} is the NS magnetic dipole in units of 10^{26} G cm^3, and $\dot{M}_{-10}$ is the mass accretion rate in units of 10^{-10} M$_\odot$ yr^{-1}. At the end of the accretion stage, the companion star decouples from its Roche lobe over a typical timescale of $\approx$ 100 Myr (Tauris 2012). If the NS spun at the magnetic equilibrium until the complete turn-off of mass accretion, this would result in a spin down of the NS well below the observed spin frequencies (Ruderman et al. 1989). A departure from spin equilibrium must therefore occur at some point. Tauris (2012) showed that spin equilibrium is broken by the rapidly expanding magnetosphere resulting from the significant decrease in the ram pressure of the transferred material when the donor star terminates its mass-transfer phase. The resulting spin down is aided by the onset of a propeller phase (Illarionov & Sunyaev 1975) which acts to bring the NS further out of equilibrium during the Roche-lobe decoupling phase.

Depending mainly on the magnetic field strength of the accreting pulsar, the loss of rotational energy computed by Tauris (2012) typically amounted to about 50 per cent, corresponding to a decrease in spin frequency of a factor $\sqrt{2}$, when the recycled pulsars switch from the accretor to the final long-term rotation-powered state. This value is of the order of the difference observed between the spin distribution of nuclear-MSPs and RMSPs, making the spin down experienced by the NS, during the permanent decoupling of the companion star from its Roche lobe, a viable explanation.

The spin distribution of accreting-MSPs, on the other hand, is closer to that of RMSPs, compared to the case of nuclear-MSPs. This might originate from the differences between the two classes of accretion-powered sources. Unlike nuclear-MSPs, accreting-MSPs possess a magnetosphere which during the quiescent states may push away the in-flowing matter, letting the NS turn on as a rotation-powered radio pulsar (*the radio ejection mechanism*, Kluzniak et al. 1988; Stella et al. 1994; Campana et al. 1998; Burderi et al. 2001; Papitto et al. 2013a). As these accreting-MSPs spend most of the time in quiescence, their spin evolution is mainly driven by the magneto-dipole torque, rather than by stronger torques associated with disc-field interactions. This implies a slower spin evolution compared to nuclear-MSPs, so that a smaller spin difference might be expected between accreting-MSPs and their rotation-powered descendants. Indeed, the only accreting-MSP from which many cycles between outbursts and quiescence have been observed, SAX J1808.4-3658 (see Patruno et al. 2012b, and references therein), spins down at a rate which would correspond to a slow down by just $\sim$ 5 Hz, over the typical time-scale (100 Myr) associated with the Roche-lobe decoupling phase of more massive donor stars leaving behind helium white dwarf companions.

Our analysis did not identify a statistically significant difference between the spin distributions of accreting- and nuclear-MSPs, despite that the average frequency shown by the latter class is larger by $\sim$ 150 Hz. However, the different results obtained when comparing these two LMXB classes with the much larger sample of RMSPs, can be taken as an indication that a difference may exist, but which is not currently detectable due the low number of objects known. A similar indication is strengthened by the significant difference found (95 per cent confidence level) when nuclear-MSPs are compared to whole sample of transitional-MSPs, rather than only accreting-MSPs. If nuclear and accreting-MSPs are assumed to spin at, or close to the equilibrium value given by Eq. 1, the contrast between the average frequencies of the two samples could be explained by a difference in the mass-accretion rate by $\Delta\dot{M}/\dot{M} \sim 0.8$, and/or in the dipole moment by $\Delta\mu/\mu \sim -0.4$. Indeed, nuclear-MSPs generally accrete at a larger average rate than accreting-MSPs (see green triangles and red circles, respectively, in Fig. 4), and are expected to possess a weaker magnetic field as they do not show coherent pulsations. A weaker field could indeed reflect a larger mass-accretion rate as well, as a plasma in-flowing at a large rate diamagnetically screens the magnetic field of the NS below its



Fig. 4. Long term mass-accretion rate of millisecond pulsars in the accretion phase, as evaluated by Watts et al. (2008). Accreting-MSPs are as plotted as red circles, and nuclear-MSPs as green squares. Magenta triangles mark those accreting-MSPs which showed pulsations only intermittently, and which could have a magnetic field close to the threshold for field burial (Cumming 2008). Blue dashed lines represent the magnetic spin equilibrium lines defined by Eq.1, and evaluated for $\mu_{26} = 1$ and $\mu_{26} = 10$, respectively. The red shaded region defines the parameter space in which a source enters the radio ejector state, for $\mu_{26} = 1$ (e.g., Burderi et al. 2001).

surface (Bhattacharya & Srinivasan 1995; Cumming et al. 2001; Cumming 2008). These considerations may be taken as a clue that nuclear-MSPs are found in an earlier evolutionary stage, characterized by a larger average accretion rate (and a consequently lower dipolar magnetic field) and a faster rotation, compared to accreting-MSPs. The latter are instead observed in a phase much closer to the accretion turn-off and to the switch-on of a RMSP, as also demonstrated by the rapid changes of state observed in some of them.

An important role in explaining the different observed spin distributions of some classes could be played by their different evolutionary history. All accreting- and nuclear-MSPs for which the orbital period is known belong to systems with $P_{orb} < 1$ day. These binaries are expected to descend from systems in which the companion star had a low mass (1-2 $M_{\odot}$) and was still on the main sequence at the onset of mass transfer. The same is probably true for the eclipsing-MSPs, i.e. the so-called black widows and redbacks, cf. Chen et al. (2013) and references therein. In contrast, RMSPs are formed both in systems with low-mass (Tauris & Savonije 1999) and intermediate-mass ($2 - 6$ $M_{\odot}$) companions (Tauris et al. 2000). Furthermore, depending on their final P_{orb} and the composition of the white dwarf companion, in some of these systems the donor star had already evolved off the main sequence at the onset of the mass transfer. Hence, all RMSPs with massive white dwarf companions, and RMSPs with helium white dwarf companions in wide orbits ($P_{orb} \gg 1$ day), are only expected to be mildly recycled as a consequence of the relatively short-lived mass-transfer phase in these systems (see Figs. 1 and 9 in Tauris et al. 2012). Given that the observed sample of non-eclipsing RMSPs contains a fraction of such mildly recycled (relatively slow spinning) sources could therefore partly explain why their observed spin distribution is slightly slower than that of eclipsing-MSPs. On the other hand, this selection bias should not affect the comparison between nuclear- and transitional-MSPs, as all these known sources evolved from low-mass companions in short orbital period systems, ensuring a long phase of mass transfer and efficient recycling. Note, an expected short and intense mass-transfer phase in wide-orbit systems can indeed also explain the hitherto non-detection of accreting- and nuclear-MSPs in such binaries.

On the other hand, instrumental selection biases are not expected to greatly affect the spin distributions considered here. Even if the detection of accretion powered X-ray pulsations at the highest frequencies is affected by Doppler shifts induced by the orbital motion, especially in ultra compact binaries ($P_{orb} \lesssim$ 1 hr), no significant bias should prevent its measurement. Similarly, such accelerated orbits would not at all affect the detection of nuclear-MSPs, as the burst signals observed from these systems are observed on time scales ($\lesssim 100$ s) much shorter than the orbital period of the binary. The reduction of sensitivity to radio pulsations of RMSPs at high spin frequencies (Dewey et al. 1985; Hessels et al. 2007) has been made less critical by recent improvements in data acquisition systems, computational power and search algorithms (Lorimer 2013; Ransom 2013). In addition, in the last five years *Fermi*-LAT allowed the discovery of a large number of galactic-RMSPs (15 per cent of the total, Ransom 2013), through the radio follow-up of unidentified γ-ray sources. As the γ-ray output of a millisecond pulsar increases with its spin-down power ($L_{\gamma} \propto \dot{E}_{sd}^{a}$, with $a = 0.5$–1 and $\dot{E}_{sd} \propto \mu^2 \nu^4$; see Abdo et al. 2013), the detection of fast spinning sources through this method is favoured. Indeed, during the last five years, the follow-up of *Fermi* sources determined an eight-fold increase in the number of known Galactic eclipsing-RMSP (Roberts 2013), which are significantly faster than the rest of RMSP, as we have shown in this work. Before this overall reduction of the bias against the detection of fast radio pulsars, Lorimer (2013) estimated the peak of the spin frequency distribution of Galactic-RMSP to be 65 Hz larger than the observed average. We consider this as a conservative upper limit on the magnitude of any remaining bias. While detailed population synthesis studies are needed to quantify the exact observational biases, we conclude that they should not severely impact the results obtained here.

In the future, X-ray observatories like the *Large Observatory for X-ray Timing* (LOFT Feroci et al. 2012), and to some extent *AstroSAT* (Agrawal 2006) and *NICER* (Gendreau et al. 2012), are expected to increase the sensitivity to fast coherent signals from accreting sources up to a factor ~ 5. At the same time, further improvement in the computational power and analysis techniques used to discover RMSPs, the numerous candidates identified by *Fermi*-LAT, and the advent of the *Square Kilometre Array* (SKA Smits et al. 2009), will also increase the number of fast radio pulsars in close binary systems. An increase in the number of sources known will be fundamental to constrain the details of pulsar recycling from the point of view of the observed spin distributions.

Acknowledgements. Work done in the framework of the grants AYA2012-39303, as well as SGR2009- 811, and iLINK2011-0303. AP is supported by a Juan de la Cierva fellowship. NR is supported by a Ramon y Cajal fellowship and by an NWO Vidi Award. DFT is additionally supported by a Friedrich Wilhelm Bessel Award of the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation. T.M.T. gratefully acknowledges financial support and hospitality at both the Argelander-Insitut für Astronomie, Universität Bonn and the Max-Planck-Institut für Radioastronomie.

References

Abdo, A. A., Ajello, M., Allafort, A., et al. 2013, ApJS, 208, 17
Agrawal, P. C. 2006, Advances in Space Research, 38, 2989
Alpar, M. A., Cheng, A. F., Ruderman, M. A., & Shaham, J. 1982, Nat., 300, 728

Archibald, A. M., Stairs, I. H., Ransom, S. M., et al. 2009, Science, 324, 1411
Bassa, C. G. et al. 2013, The Astronomer's Telegram, 5647, 1
Bhattacharya, D. & Srinivasan, G. 1995, X-ray Binaries, 495
Bhattacharya, D. & van den Heuvel, E. P. J. 1991, Phys.Rep., 203, 1
Breton, R. P., van Kerkwijk, M. H., Roberts, M. S. E., et al. 2013, ApJ, 769, 108
Burderi, L., Di Salvo, T., D'Antona, F., Robba, N. R., & Testa, V. 2003, A&A, 404, L43
Burderi, L., Possenti, A., D'Antona, F., et al. 2001, ApJ, 560, L71
Burderi, L., Riggio, A., Di Salvo, T., et al. 2009, A&A, 496, L17
Burgay, M., Burderi, L., Possenti, A., et al. 2003, ApJ, 589, 902
Campana, S., Colpi, M., Mereghetti, S., Stella, L., & Tavani, M. 1998, A&A Rev., 8, 279
Campana, S., D'Avanzo, P., Casares, J., et al. 2004, ApJ, 614, L49
Chakrabarty, D., Morgan, E. H., Muno, M. P., et al. 2003, Nat., 424, 42
Chen, H.-L., Chen, X., Tauris, T. M., & Han, Z. 2013, ApJ, 775, 27
Coriat, M., Fender, R. P., & Dubus, G. 2012, MNRAS, 424, 1991
Cumming, A. 2008, in American Institute of Physics Conference Series, Vol. 1068, American Institute of Physics Conference Series, ed. R. Wijnands, D. Altamirano, P. Soleri, N. Degenaar, N. Rea, P. Casella, A. Patruno, & M. Linares, 152–159
Cumming, A., Zweibel, E., & Bildsten, L. 2001, ApJ, 557, 958
D'Avanzo, P., Campana, S., Casares, J., et al. 2009, A&A, 508, 297
Dewey, R. J., Taylor, J. H., Weisberg, J. M., & Stokes, G. H. 1985, ApJ, 294, L25
Di Salvo, T., Burderi, L., Riggio, A., Papitto, A., & Menna, M. T. 2008, MNRAS, 389, 1851
Feroci, M., Stella, L., van der Klis, M., et al. 2012, Experimental Astronomy, 34, 415
Ferrario, L. & Wickramasinghe, D. 2007, MNRAS, 375, 1009
Ferrigno, C., Bozzo, E., Papitto, A., et al. 2013, ArXiv e-prints
Fruchter, A. S., Stinebring, D. R., & Taylor, J. H. 1988, Nat., 333, 237
Galloway, D. K., Muno, M. P., Hartman, J. M., Psaltis, D., & Chakrabarty, D. 2008, ApJS, 179, 360
Gendreau, K. C., Arzoumanian, Z., & Okajima, T. 2012, in Society of Photo-Optical Instrumentation Engineers (SPIE) Conference Series, Vol. 8443, Society of Photo-Optical Instrumentation Engineers (SPIE) Conference Series
Ghosh, P. & Lamb, F. K. 1979, ApJ, 234, 296
Hartman, J. M., Galloway, D. K., & Chakrabarty, D. 2011, ApJ, 726, 26
Hessels, J. W. T. 2008, in American Institute of Physics Conference Series, Vol. 1068, American Institute of Physics Conference Series, ed. R. Wijnands, D. Altamirano, P. Soleri, N. Degenaar, N. Rea, P. Casella, A. Patruno, & M. Linares, 130–134
Hessels, J. W. T., Ransom, S. M., Stairs, I. H., Kaspi, V. M., & Freire, P. C. C. 2007, ApJ, 670, 363
Iacolina, M. N., Burgay, M., Burderi, L., Possenti, A., & di Salvo, T. 2009, A&A, 497, 445
Iacolina, M. N., Burgay, M., Burderi, L., Possenti, A., & di Salvo, T. 2010, A&A, 519, A13
Illarionov, A. F. & Sunyaev, R. A. 1975, A&A, 39, 185
Kluźniak, W. & Rappaport, S. 2007, ApJ, 671, 1990
Kluzniak, W., Ruderman, M., Shaham, J., & Tavani, M. 1988, Nat., 334, 225
Kuiper, N. H. 1960, Proc. Kon. Ned. Akad. Wetensch., A, 63
Linares, M., Bahramian, A., Heinke, C., et al. 2013, MNRAS
Lorimer, D. R. 2013, in IAU Symposium, Vol. 291, IAU Symposium, 237–242
Paltani, S. 2004, A&A, 420, 789
Papitto, A., Ferrigno, C., Bozzo, E., et al. 2013a, Nat., 501, 517
Papitto, A., Riggio, A., Burderi, L., et al. 2011, A&A, 528, A55
Papitto, A., Torres, D. F., & Li, J. 2013b, MNRAS, in press, arXiv:1312.0456
Patruno, A. 2010a, in Proceedings of High Time Resolution Astrophysics - The Era of Extremely Large Telescopes (HTRA-IV). May 5 - 7, 2010. Agios Nikolaos, Crete Greece.
Patruno, A. 2010b, ApJ, 722, 909
Patruno, A., Alpar, M. A., van der Klis, M., & van den Heuvel, E. P. J. 2012a, ApJ, 752, 33
Patruno, A., Archibald, A. M., Hessels, J. W. T., et al. 2014, ApJ, 781, L3
Patruno, A., Bult, P., Gopakumar, A., et al. 2012b, ApJ, 746, L27
Patruno, A. & Watts, A. L. 2012, ArXiv e-prints
Radhakrishnan, V. & Srinivasan, G. 1982, Current Science, 51, 1096
Ransom, S. M. 2013, in IAU Symposium, Vol. 291, IAU Symposium, 3–10
Rappaport, S. A., Fregeau, J. M., & Spruit, H. 2004, ApJ, 606, 436
Riggio, A., Burderi, L., Di Salvo, T., et al. 2011, A&A, 531, A140
Roberts, M. S. E. 2013, in IAU Symposium, Vol. 291, IAU Symposium, 127–132
Ruderman, M., Shaham, J., & Tavani, M. 1989, ApJ, 336, 507
Smits, R., Kramer, M., Stappers, B., et al. 2009, A&A, 493, 1161
Stappers, B. W., Archibald, A. M., Hessels, J. W. T., et al. 2013, ArXiv e-prints
Stella, L., Campana, S., Colpi, M., Mereghetti, S., & Tavani, M. 1994, ApJ, 423, L47
Stephens, M. A. 1974, J. Am. Statist. Assoc.
Tauris, T. M. 2012, Science, 335, 561
Tauris, T. M., Langer, N., & Kramer, M. 2012, MNRAS, 425, 1601
Tauris, T. M. & Savonije, G. J. 1999, A&A, 350, 928
Tauris, T. M., van den Heuvel, E. P. J., & Savonije, G. J. 2000, ApJ, 530, L93
Verbunt, F., van den Heuvel, E. P. J., van Paradijs, J., & Rappaport, S. A. 1987, Nat., 329, 312
Watts, A. L. 2012, A&AR, 50, 609
Watts, A. L., Krishnan, B., Bildsten, L., & Schutz, B. F. 2008, MNRAS, 389, 839
Watts, A. L. et al. 2009, ApJ, 698, L174
Wijnands, R. & van der Klis, M. 1998, Nat., 394, 344
Xing, Y. & Wang, Z. 2013, ApJ, 769, 119